



PATENT APPLICATION

THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of

Docket No: Q65606

Kentaro KONISHI, et al.

Allowed: July 28, 2006

Appln. No.: 09/919,989

Group Art Unit: 2628

Confirmation No.: 6406

Examiner: Kimbinh T. NGUYEN

Filed: July 30, 2001

For: TIME-SERIES DATA PROCESSING DEVICE AND METHOD

**COMMENTS ON EXAMINER'S STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE**

**MAIL STOP ISSUE FEE**

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

Applicant makes the following comments on the Examiner's statement of reasons for allowance:

The Examiner's statement should not be misinterpreted as meaning that the identified features are the only patentable features in any of the claims. The independent claims and the dependent claims include various aspects which provide a separate basis for patentability. The Examiner's statement emphasizes certain aspects of the claims, but each claim should be interpreted using its own precise language, without inferring any particular emphasis from the Examiner's statement.


The claims are carefully written to precisely define the bounds of the invention, and persons reading these remarks hereafter should note that any difference between the Examiner's language and the language of the claims should be resolved by recourse to only the express language of the claims.

Patent Office personnel are requested to note that the present submission does not adversely affect the patent term adjustment accrued by Applicant to date. As emphasized in the "Clarification

Draft Comments on Examiner's Statement of Reasons for Allowance  
U.S. Appln. No. 09/919,989  
Attorney Docket No.: Q65606

of 37 C.F.R. §1.704(c)(10) – Reduction of Patent Term Adjustment for Certain Types of Papers Filed After a Notice of Allowance Has Been Mailed,” 1247OG111 (6/26/01), “a response to the examiner’s reasons for allowance” is an example of a paper that does “not cause substantial interference and delay in the patent issue process” and is “not considered a ‘failure to engage in reasonable efforts’ to conclude processing or examination of the application.” Therefore, the Applicant remains entitled to the full patent term adjustment set forth on page 3 of the Notice of Allowance mailed July 28, 2006.

Respectfully submitted,



Nataliya Dverson  
Registration No. 56,616

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE  
**23373**  
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: October 30, 2006

Attorney Docket No.: Q65606